SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. V, No. 20 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | November 15, 1975

Down and Out in Academe: A Talk with Grant Swinger

Seated in a Washington hotel lobby last week, we heard a familiar voice softly singing to itself, "Director, can you spare a grant?"

Looking up, we saw it came from our old acquaintance Dr. Grant Swinger, director of the Center for the Absorption of Federal Funds. Grant was a visibly aged and frayed version of the optimistic, successful chap we had first come to know in the early 1960s. Though he was neatly attired, his unfashionably narrow lapels and out-of-date tie indicated that he was considerably overdue for a visit to Ye Campus Outfitters. Nevertheless, the old spark was there in his eyes as he put aside a copy of *Commerce Business Daily* and vigorously shook our hands.

After exchanging greetings, Grant said, "Thinking back to when we first met, it must have been either at the information explosion or the population explosion conference. I can't remember which one."

"Information explosion," we reminded him, as we recalled that weeklong, all-expense meeting at a seaside resort in 1961. "Whatever came of that conference?" we asked.

"Well," said Grant, "it was a fine conference. Fantastic buffet that last night, and we got a program going at the Center, but before we knew it, Washington lost interest in the information explosion. It seems that everyone who was asked about it agreed that it was a serious problem, but that his own field was getting along fine. So the office that was supporting us was dissolved, but fortunately one of the people turned up in population and we got a piece of that."

"What happened?"

"Oh, that turned out to be a shorttimer, too. But then science policy came along and we really got a program going. We tenured a few people and got a flock of graduate students. You remember that national symposium we sponsored? Must have been in '63. Science Policy and the Senior Citizen. Really packed 'em in, as you might have expected with all those travel grants we had. You remember travel grants?" he asked wistfully, like a newly impoverished gourmet recalling a longago three-star experience.

"Yes, of course," we said.

"You know," he quickly added, now showing some bitterness, "we even had to relinquish the Pan American Chair."

"You mean you've dropped Latin American studies?"

"Oh, no. I mean the year-'round ticket we had on Pan American Airlines."

"What happened after science policy?" we asked.

"For a time we got into disarmament, and we hedged a bit with curriculum reform. You know, chemistry for the music major and that stuff. We sensed that things were a bit shakey and we wanted to diversify. We added more faculty and graduate students, and we even took some of the old ones who

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

The National Science Foundation has a new policy of advertising in scientific journals to fill vacancies in its top executive positions. An administrator there explained that "we want to cast the net as far as possible and open up the process." New emphasis, he said, will be placed on recruiting high-level scientific talent for the top positions. "We've got a very strong administrative structure. What we need is good scientific judgment," he said.

Private institutions of higher education are providing a declining share of employment for scientists and engineers in the overall academic picture, according to a newly published NSF report. Their proportion "has declined steadily for at least the last six years, from 36 per cent of the total in 1969 to 30 per cent in 1975." The report, NSF 75-331, is available without charge from NSF, Division of Science Resources Study, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20550.

Clark Kerr, chairman of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies, has announced plans for a study of the effects of federal agency policies on higher education. The study will be directed by Frederick Bohlen, a twice-unsuccessful congressional candidate who's been around the government and foundation circuit.

David Hamburg, of the Stanford University Medical School, has accepted appointment to a 5-year term as president of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences. He succeeds Donald Fredrickson, who left in July to become director of NIH.

Swinger: Disaster Averted By Oceanography, But Then...

(Continued from Page 1)

couldn't find jobs and gave them postdocs. You remember postdocs?"

"Sure, but what happened then?"

"We chucked the whole thing for space. NASA told us to get a move on or we'd be left out, so we got in our application and they came across, just like they promised."

"That must have been a good arrangement."

"It was—for a while. But after the historic moon-landing, whenever that was, NASA told us we had to reorient the program, so we got into civilian technology."

"How did that work out?"

"Pretty good for a while. We added some more tenured professors and graduate students and hired some of the postdocs as consultants to make room for some of the graduate students who needed postdocs. But civilian technology turned out to be thin pickings. We worked on lawnmowers for a while with a government agency, but then there was an investigation of some sort that turned off the whole thing."

"What did you do then?"

"We were saved from disaster by oceanography. We recycled the old space center into an oceanography center. But I'm getting ahead of myself. We first had that conference—maybe you were there: Oceanography or Oceanology—A Time for Choice."

"What was the result?"

"Oceanography, of course, and that put us in a good position, and we got a development grant. But then the agency was reorganized and they notified us that we weren't going to make the jump from development to operations money. So, we looked around a bit and came across ecology, which was just getting going, and we got in an application that stressed our competence in ecology."

"How did that turn out?"

"All right for a time, but then environment crowded out ecology and when we tried to get into environment, they hauled out our old application to prove that our competence was in ecology."

"What was the result of that?"

"Well, we were frantic, what with all those professors, graduate students, and postdocs, but they took some of the pressure off us by giving some of them jobs in Washington as program directors in environment."

'Next?"

"One of our people went to a conference on solid waste disposal and came back pretty enthusiastic. So we recycled the old oceanography center into a solid waste disposal center. But then the congressman who had been helping us out with these problems got sick and died, and we lost the grant. We had trouble trying to meet the payroll. The vice president for academic affairs even warned us that if something didn't come along soon, some of us would actually have to teach At the Center, we've always resolved the conflict between teaching and research by doing neither. We felt desperate.

"Well, that lit a fire under some of our people and we were all prepared when energy came along. We were off the mark fast with an application and now we've got a pretty thriving operation."

"What does it deal with?"

"Well, for the foreseeable future, I'd say it's recession proof. We perform critiques of other people's energy reports. You know, they come out with a report, and we hold a conference on it. It's also called technology assessment. The backlog could fill a warehouse and they're still coming in."

"What happens with your critiques?"

"We don't know for sure, but we understand that the agency wants to put out a contract for someone to evaluate our critiques. In any case, it's a growth industry, and we're feeling a lot better."

"Grant, what brings you to Washington?"

"Naturally, after what we've gone through in these years, we're a bit nervous, even about energy. It could come and go like the information explosion. It could disappear just like the automation problem. Remember that one? Came and went before we could put together a conference. So, we're scouting around."

"What do you see?"

"There are several possibilities and we have our contingency plans. For example, if energy goes sour, we'll try to gain time by holding a conference on Technology: Master or Servant? That always packs 'em in and provides a breather.

"But for the long haul," he continued, "we need something steady and I think ethics looks like a growth field. We've recycled some of our solid waste people into ethicists, so we're ready if the need arises."

"Ethics?"

"Sure, we'd start off with a conference on The Ethics of Solar Energy, and we'd come out with a recommendation for a research program. Sounds farfetched, but it's worked before."

"We hope so."

"Listen," he said, looking at his watch. "Nice to see you, but I've got to run along. Gotta catch a bus to Seattle." —DSG

House Passes Bill Creating Presidential Science Office

With few Congressmen showing any interest, and none expressing any opposition, the House of Representatives on November 4 finally got around to passing a bill to re-establish a White House science policy office.

If the measure is left unchanged by the Senate — which is unlikely — it would virtually re-create the Office of Science and Technology which Nixon scrapped in January 1973, when he decided that he no longer required the services of a full-time science adviser.

The bill was drafted by a few key legislators and committee staffers in close collaboration with the White House, and it is said to have President Ford's complete blessing. In fact, one architect of the measure, Rep. Charles Mosher (R-Ohio), told his colleagues that Ford had telephoned him the day before the House passed it, to relate "the importance he attaches to our approval of this bill and his hope that . . . it will emerge essentially in the form as we have it here."

Mosher's plea for the measure to be left intact was probably pitched more toward the Senate than toward his fellow congressmen, because there was scant evidence that anybody in the House was interested enough to modify the bill. Senator Kennedy, however, has long expressed a desire for something a bit more substantial.

The bill is now under consideration by three Senate committees, which have recently been holding joint hearings on a variety of science policy bills. A final version is expected to be drafted for Senate consideration in December, and after conference with the House, it could be on Ford's desk in January.

By that time, the White House will be battened down for the elections, and with the Ford Administration's longevity already in considerable doubt, nothing too dramatic should be expected from the office, at least until after the elections are out of the way.

The House-passed version of the bill conforms fairly closely to President Ford's modest proposal, which he sent to Congress in June (SGR Vol. V, No. 12), and it differs little from the bill introduced more recently by Reps. Mosher and Olin Teague (D-Tex.) (SGR Vol. V, No. 15).

It would establish an Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) in the Executive Office of the President. The director of OSTP, whose appointment would be subject to Senate confirmation, would double as the President's science adviser, and his advice would extend over all areas involving science and technology, including military matters.

Exactly how OSTP would fit into the White House's power structure isn't spelled out in any detail, except

(Continued on Page 4)

Ramo Reported Due for Post

Although Congress is still weeks away from completing action on the bill to reestablish a White House science policy office, speculation is underway concerning who will be the first director of the office. A likely contender who, according to sources in Congress and the Administration, has been sounded out about the job is Simon Ramo, an electrical engineer and Vice Chairman of TRW Inc., a major defense contractor.

In a conversation with SGR last week, Ramo said he would not comment directly on the matter, though he acknowledged that he had been active in helping Vice President Rockefeller to seek opinions on the structure of the office and how it should be set up. Ramo also said that he had discussed the office some time ago with President Ford, who showed "a deep appreciation of what we were talking about."

As for the functions of the office, Ramo suggested that it should have a strong input into military policymaking: "unless it deals with military as well as non-military research and development, then you could say that the office would be a failure," he said. He also warned that it should not be regarded as a representative of science, but as an integral part of the President's staff.

Science & Government Report © 1975

Contributing Editors
Colin Norman, Pamela Moore

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report*, Inc., 22 times per year. Annual subscription: Institutions, $65 (two years, $120); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Review Panel Says FDA Fails to Rebut Staff Charges

Dense and buoyant as the proverbial lead balloon, a 906-page, $196,000 defense of the Food and Drug Administration has just been issued by Commissioner Alexander Schmidt and has been quickly rejected by the outside review panel for which it was prepared.

Schmidt's *Commissioner's Report,* in the works for over a year, was inspired by charges made at a Senate hearing in August 1974 by 11 present and former FDA employees and three outside consultants. Testifying before the subcommittee on health and the subcommittee on administrative practice and procedures, both chaired by Senator Kennedy, the witnesses charged that their approvals of new drugs were almost invariably endorsed by their superiors, but their disapprovals were frequently overruled; also, when they raised questions about new drugs, they often were harassed, denied promotions, and frequently were transferred to make-work jobs unrelated to their training and professional experience.

In brief, they contended that FDA was excessively responsive to industry pressures and was failing in its statutory duty to assure the safety and efficacy of pharmaceutical drugs.

Schmidt denied it all, and at his request, the then-Secretary of HEW, Caspar Weinberger, authorized two inquiries, one by Schmidt, which was to look at the specific allegations, and the other by a 7-member Secretary's Review Panel on New Drug Regulation, which was to be established to evaluate Schmidt's report as part of a comprehensive examination of FDA's performance.

Commissioner's Report, a melange of intra-departmental memos, minutes of grievance proceedings and cheery conclusions by Commissioner Schmidt, is so dense, turgid, and contradictory as to make the reader wonder whether CIA has indeed ceased experimenting with hallucinogens in the FDA ventilating system.

Schmidt, however, is happy with his report, for in a preface he states, "While long, it is easily read, and I judge, holds one's interest well."

One of his main conclusions is that his investigation "has not only revealed no evidence to support such general charges (as made in the Senate hearings); it has produced evidence to refute those charges—evidence long available."

However, he also states:

"If someone is transferred and is never told why—if a memorandum is corrected, properly, but without notice to the author who accidentally discovers the charge—if a formal recommendation is given by someone as part of his or her job, and the advice not followed, and the rejection never explained—if supervisor and employee, or two equal colleagues, aren't speaking to one another but are engaged in exchanging damaging broadsides—if meetings with industry are properly held, but interested parties not in attendance never informed of the results of the meeting—if per-

(Continued on Page 5)

SCIENCE ADVISER *(Continued from Page 3)*

that the director is told to "maintain liaison with all councils and offices of the Executive Office of the President and develop appropriate working relationships with the National Security Council and the Domestic Council." In other words, the office would fit in as best it could, and its influence would depend in large measure on the amount of support it receives from the President.

Since the original impetus inside the White House for a reincarnation of OST came from Vice President Rockefeller, who has just written himself off Ford's ticket, the influence potential of the new office is uncertain.

One noteworthy feature of the bill is that it would establish a Federal Science and Technology Survey Committee, chaired by the director of OSTP, which would conduct a two-year survey of the federal government's science and technology activities, including "missions, goals, personnel, funding activities, organization, facilities and activities in general."

Though no funding level is specified in the bill, the House Science and Technology Committee, which handled the legislation, estimated that the office would require about $2.1 millioin a year, and the survey another $1 million.

As for the prospects for the bill in the Senate, there is at present some uncertainty about whether or not the Senate version will call for an office headed by a single director or by a three-member Council of Science and Technology Advisers. Be that as it may, it's very likely that the Senate version will include a strong statement setting out a number of goals for federal science policy. A bill sponsored by Senator Kennedy, which has twice been approved by the Senate, for example, specifies funding targets for non-military science and technology at least equal to outlays on defense and space research and development. Similar sentiments can be expected to have a place in the Senate version of the White House science policy bill.—CN

FDA Aide Criticized for Urging Carcinogen Warning

One of the items that surfaces in *Commissioner's Report* is a previously confidential 1970 FDA memo concerning John O. Nestor, a longtime FDA employe who disclosed suppressed clinical data concerning the lethal dangers of the drug MER/29 in the early 1960s.

Nestor, who has been harrassed and kicked around FDA for years — he once was transferred and his office emptied out without his prior knowledge—is described in the memo as producing "medical and decisions (that) appear sound."

But the memo, by the director of the Office of Scientific Evaluation, goes on to state:

"However, his judgments as to the modus operandi in interactions between the FDA and the patient, FDA and clinical investigators, and FDA and industry are questionable. For example, in the case of IND (Investigational New Drug) 5096 (Triflocin) Dr. Nestor recommended that each human subject of this experiment be adequately informed of the risk to which he or she had been exposed. The proposed disclosure statement implied in no uncertain terms that the patient had been treated with a carcinogenic agent. It is highly questionable whether this would be the proper approach for all patients."

REPORT *(Continued from Page 4)*

sonnel problems are not directly and rapidly resolved, but left to fester untended—if every effort is not always made to disseminate and enforce policy—then the logical result will be misinterpretation, suspicion, false conclusion, unhappiness, and poor morals. *Unfortunately, all these events have occurred in the past decade* (italics supplied); some will undoubtedly reoccur."

Through the Review Panel, chaired by Thomas Chalmers, president of Mt. Sinai Medical Center, New York, is still in the midst of its work and was under no compulsion to state its reaction to *Commissioner's Report,* apparently it was so incensed by the tome that on November 12 it issued a statement. Noting that "a detailed analysis" was yet to be made, the Panel explained that "the staff has studied some drafts and final chapters of the report and preliminary discussions have been held between the review panel staff and individual panel members, all of whom have reviewed these drafts."

"The panel's current judgment," it stated, "is that the Commissioner's investigation did not obtain information essential to resolve significant numbers of allegations. In those chapters examined by panel members and staff, the Commissioner's Report does not, for example, disprove allegations that FDA (1) succumbed to industry pressures, and (2) made discriminatory transfers of personnel.

"The panel's conclusions and supporting detailed analyses of the allegations will be released when the review has been completed."

At present, completion is scheduled for June.

In the meantime, the position of Commissioner Schmidt is without visible means of support. And though we have not heard anything reliable, one way or the other, about his intentions, it is difficult to see how he can continue in office when his mammoth defense has been rejected.—DSG

(Copies of *Commissioner's Report* may be obtained without charge by writing to the Office of Public Affairs, Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Md. 20852).

Letter to the Editor

(The following letter is in response to an article in which SGR (Vol. V, No. 19), reporting an offer of scientific "guidance or assistance" to the Arab states by the President of Israel's Weizmann Institute, suggested that an offer of cooperation would probably be more acceptable):

Dear Sir:

Just reading your issue of November 1st, and wanted to point out my complete agreement with your observation on the proper approach for scientific cooperation between Israel and the Arab states.

I have been discussing this very point with some colleagues, both in Israel and our own government, and my suggestion has been to focus on some specific joint venture. In fact, we should probably think in terms of "technical cooperation" rather than "scientific cooperation."

The remarks of Dr. Sela are probably a reasonable reflection of the considerable dominance of the academic community within the Israeli technical structure. This is their great reservoir, and also their greatest obstacle with regard to implementing the results of their research.

Your comments were certainly very much in order.

Sincerely,
Herbert I. Fusfeld
Director of Research
Kennecott Copper Corporation
New York, NY

Kennedy Bill Seeks Reorganization for FDA

Following months of probing by his Senate health subcommittee, which has unearthed a glut of scandalous episodes in the testing, approval and marketing of prescription drugs, Senator Kennedy has come to the conclusion that "there are fundamental defects in our nation's current regulatory procedures for prescription drugs, and these defects can no longer be ignored." Consequently, he has introduced a bill to break up the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and radically alter the manner in which drugs and medical devices are regulated.

The bill, which at this writing was about to be introduced into the Senate, is likely to spark the first major debate on drug regulation since the food and drug laws were last revised, through the 1962 Kefauver Amendments. In a speech at Tulane University on November 2, Kennedy said he would hold hearings on the measure next Spring, and in the meantime, his subcommittee will sound out the views of interested parties.

Proceeding from the assumption that the FDA, is, as Kennedy put it during his Tulane speech, "overextended and unable to do its work responsibly (because of) its incredible range of unrelated responsibilities and its insufficient scientific expertise," the bill would split FDA into two separate agencies — a Drug and Devices Administration and a Food and Cosmetics Administration. Since the two agencies would have "much more manageable responsibilities and much more reasonable mandates," Kennedy reckons that they would be able to conduct their business more efficiently and effectively.

A major change in drug regulation, designed to provide better surveillance over some new drugs and to bring a few products more swiftly into use, is incorporated in the bill. At present, once a drug has completed clinical trials, it is either approved for widespread use, or kept off the market entirely. But Kennedy wants to see an extra step put into the approval process for some drugs, to allow "broad but carefully controlled distribution of a drug before final approval is given."

The idea is that once clinical trials are completed, some drugs would be placed on limited distribution and a random follow-up would be conducted to gain extra information on the efficacy and side effects of those drugs. The bill would allow the Drug and Devices Administration to decide which drugs should be placed on limited distribution before full approval.

That change seeks to answer two oft-heard criticisms of the drug-review process. First, once a drug is approved by FDA, there is virtually no follow-up to determine medical experience with it. FDA has a system for receiving reports of adverse reactions to drugs, but a recent General Accounting Office investigation found the system in chaos (SGR Vol. IV, No. 6). Even FDA Administrator Alexander Schmidt recently acknowledged that "the greatest single weakness of our present regulatory system is the abysmal reporting by almost all professionals of their drug experience — good, bad or indifferent."

"The absurdity of the system is staggering," Kennedy noted. "We clear a drug for a particular use. We are meticulous about requiring proof of effectiveness for that use. We spend millions of dollars and years of time in developing that proof. But once a drug is finally approved, it is turned loose, free from all controls and follow-up."

The second advantage claimed by Kennedy for the change is that it would actually help shorten the time it takes to bring some drugs into use. Once safety questions have been resolved, Kennedy's bill would allow a drug to be put swiftly into limited distribution.

Finally, to counter what Kennedy regards as "one of the major shortcomings" of FDA, the bill would attempt to strengthen the quality of the agency's scientific staff by reserving some scientific positions for academic scientists who would come into the agency for two or three years "in positions of real responsibility, with the opportunity to do laboratory work of their own." "Because "FDA has failed to attract and keep the top-level scientific talent it needs," Kennedy said, "too often, FDA yields to the temptation to use caution and delay as substitutes for expertise and scientific judgment."

Reaction to Kennedy's proposals within FDA has been mixed. Schmidt said last week, in a speech at Tulane University, that he would welcome a much more flexible review and approval processes for new drug applications, and he suggested that limited distribution and strict surveillance before complete approval of some drugs "might permit earlier appearance in the United States of many drugs, in return for a longer investigational phase controlled by FDA." He added "this seems to me a reasonable trade off."

But Schmidt declared himself opposed to the move to split FDA into separate agencies since there is much common ground in the regulation of food additives and drugs. A central legal and enforcement function in FDA can effectively handle both areas, he said.

Nevertheless, Schmidt acknowledged that "when Senator Kennedy suggests changes in FDA's structure, we are inclined to pay close attention."—CN

Freedom of Information–

FDA, NIH Hit by Court Orders to Open Up

In a ruling which could have broad imnplications, a federal court has stripped away the Food and Drug Administration's justification for keeping many of its advisory committee meetings secret.

The ruling, which FDA will almost certainly appeal, was handed down on October 31 by US District Judge Charles R. Richey, in a freedom of information suit brought against FDA by the Health Research Group, an organization linked with Ralph Nader. After being rebuffed by FDA, Sidney Wolfe, director of the Health Research Group, went to court in December 1973 to obtain access to transcripts of meetings held by a committee which advised FDA on the effectiveness of over-the-counter antacid drugs.

FDA claimed, as it has in several similar cases, that the committee's deliberations are exempt from public disclosure because they are an integrated part of FDA's decision-making process. Transcripts of the committee meetings should therefore be regarded as intra-agency memoranda, which are specifically protected from the Advisory Committee Act, FDA argued.

The antacid panel, which was one of several different committees set up by FDA to examine data on the effectiveness of over-the-counter drugs, was sharply critical of several products, and its recommendations were accepted by FDA and incorporated into draft regulations.

Judge Richey argued, however, that, like any other advisory committee, the panel was not empowered to make decisions on its own, and it should therefore be subject to all the requirements of the Advisory Committee Act. He stated that "to allow the Antacid Panel to avail itself of the (b) (5) exemption in denying requests for transcripts of the panel's meetings would be tantamount to burying the type of deliberations which the Advisory Committee Act sought to bring to the light of day."

If the ruling is upheld, it would force open many similar FDA committees which review data on drugs and food additives and make recommendations to the agency.

Meanwhile, a ruling providing for public access to NIH grant applications has not been well received at NIH and its sister organization, the National Institute of Mental Health. Both of their inhouse staff organizations, represented by the Inter-Assembly Council of the Assemblies of Scientists of NIH and NIMH, have endorsed a statement calling for their members to refrain from seeking access to applications. The statement, addressed to Intramural Scientists of NIH and NIMH, was voted on September 24 and reads as follows:

"As you know, applications for Research Grants have always been considered by the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health to be privileged documents. No scientist, either in or out of government, has had access to them other than the members and consultants of the relevant scientific review panels. Now, as required by the Freedom of Information Act, NIH and NIMH will make available upon proper request any and all approved and funded Grant Applications. . . .

"The Inter-Assembly Council of the Assemblies of Scientists of the National Institutes of Health and National Institute of Mental Health, while fully recognizing the legal right of scientists to make such a request, strongly urges that NIH and NIMH Intramural scientists voluntarily continue to act according to past practice and not request copies of Grant Applications. We advocate this policy because we fear the effectiveness of the Peer Review system may be diminished and biomedical research impeded if applicants believe their Grant Applications will be widely circulated."

$3.2–Million Environment Grant

The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences has awarded approximately $3.2 million to the University of Rochester for establishment of an Environmental Health Sciences Center. The center will be headed by Thomas W. Clarkson, professor of medicine at the University.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $65 ☐; two years, $120 ☐
Individual subscribers: one year, $44 ☐; two years, $75 ☐

(Overseas airmail, $17.50 per year additional.)

Name_____

Address_____

_____

Zip

Study of Advisers Lists All 22,702 of Them

Bulk quantities of high-protein feed for conspiratorial theorists have just been dispensed by the Senate Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting, and Management in its 4460-page *Third Annual Report of Federal Advisory Committees.* For those who prefer an abbreviated version, there's a 1412-page index listing the 22,702 members of the federal government's 1242 advisory committees, where they're from, and whom advise.

Some highlights listed in an accompanying press release are as follows: Universities with the largest number of advisers are the University of California (all campuses), 350; Harvard, 167; University of Texas, 110; MIT, 103; Johns Hopkins and the University of Michigan, 103 each, and Columbia, 102.

The score for industrial firms is AT&T and RCA, 95 each; ITT, 86; GE, 80; Communications Satellite Corporation, 64; Exxon, 48; IBM, 40; Mitre Corp., 37, and Boeing, 36.

The AFL-CIO is listed for 92 advisers.

The subcommittee also reports that "one Comsat employee serves on 15 advisory committees, one Federal Aviation Administration employee serves on 10, and one from the Federal Communications Commission serves on 9."

The *Third Annual Report* contains the name, function, authority for and roster of every advisory committee, plus a list of the reports they issued in 1974, the dates of their meetings, whether they were open or closed, and the costs of maintaining the committee. The *Report* is available on microfilm for $24 prepaid. Specify Catalog Microcopy No. A-1199 and order from the National Archives and Records Service, Washington, DC 20408.

The *Federal Advisory Committees* index is available for $15.50 from the US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. It is not unusual, however, for your friendly Congressman to get you one free by requesting it from the Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting, and Management, 161 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510; telephone (202) 224-1474.

NSF Science for Citizens Series Announces Regional Meetings

The National Science Foundation, in response to a directive written into its 1976 authorization act by Senator Kennedy, has announced a series of regional meetings to help in the development of a "Science for Citizens" program.

A nebulous attempt to enlist the participation of scientists and engineers in public policy debates on matters involving science and technology, the program is an offshoot of Kennedy's recent people's participation kick. According to an NSF announcement, the objective is to "improve public policy issues involving science and technology, to facilitate the participation of experienced scientists and engineers as well as graduate and undergraduate students in public activities, . . . and to enable nonprofit citizen's public interest groups to acquire necessary technical expertise."

The first of the regional meetings will be held in Chicago on December 1, and others will be held during December in Atlanta, Dallas, Denver, San Francisco, Washington, DC, and Boston. Full details are available from Jack Sanderson, Deputy Assistant Director for Science Education, NSF, Washington, DC 20550.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106